arXiv:1704.02836v1 [math.OC] 10 Apr 2017

The quadratic M-convexity testing problem*

Yuni Iwamasa†

April 11, 2017

Abstract

A function f on $\{0,1\}^n$ is said to be M-convex if for $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $i \in [n]$ with $x_i > y_i$, there exists $j \in [n]$ with $y_j > x_j$ satisfying $f(x) + f(y) \geq f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j)$, where χ_i is the ith unit vector. M-convex functions play a central role in discrete convex analysis.

In this paper, we consider the quadratic M-convexity testing problem (QMCTP). This is the problem of deciding whether a given form $\sum_{i\in[n]} a_i x_i + \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq n} a_{ij} x_i x_j$ on $\sum_{i\in[n]} x_i = r$ is M-convex, where $a_i \in \mathbf{R}$ and $a_{ij} \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. It is known that if every a_{ij} takes a finite value, then (QMCTP) can be solved in polynomial time. We show that (QMCTP) is co-NP complete in general, and but is polynomial-time solvable under a mild assumption. Furthermore, we propose an $O(n^2)$-time algorithm for solving (QMCTP) under the assumption.

Keywords: discrete convex analysis, M-convex, testing problem

1 Introduction

A function f on $\{0,1\}^n$ is said to be *M-convex* [6] if it satisfies the following exchange axiom:

Exchange Axiom: For $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)$, there exists $j \in \mathrm{supp}(y) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(x)$ such that

$$f(x) + f(y) \geq f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j),$$

where $\mathrm{supp}(x) := \{i \mid x_i = 1\}$ for $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \{0,1\}^n$ and χ_i is the ith unit vector. In general, M-convex functions are defined on the integer lattice $\mathbf{Z}^n$. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to consider M-convex functions defined on $\{0,1\}^n$, which are equivalent to negative of *valuated matroids* introduced by Dress–Wenzel [2, 3]. M-convex functions play a central role in *discrete convex analysis* [7]. Indeed, M-convex functions appear in many areas such as operations research, economics, and game theory (see e.g., [7, 8, 9]). Quadratic M-convex functions also appear in many areas, and constitute a basic and important class of discrete functions. Quadratic M-convex functions have a close relationship with *tree metrics* [4], which is an important concept for mathematical analysis in phylogenetics (see e.g., [11]). Recently, Iwamasa–Murota–Živný [5] have revealed hidden quadratic M-convexity in valued constraint satisfaction problems with joint winner property, and presented a perspective to their polynomial-time solvability from discrete convex analysis.

In this paper, we consider the *quadratic M-convexity testing problem (QMCTP)* defined as follows. Let $\overline{\mathbf{R}} := \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $[n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ for a positive integer n with $n \geq 4$.

*A preliminary version of this paper has appeared in the proceedings of the 10th Japanese-Hungarian Symposium on Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications.

†Department of Mathematical Informatics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 113-8656, Japan.
Email: yuni_iwamasa@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Given: $a_i \in \mathbf{R}$ for $i \in [n]$, $a_{ij} \in \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, and a positive integer r with $2 \leq r \leq n-2$.
Question: Is the quadratic function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ defined by

$$f(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) := \begin{cases} \sum_{i \in [n]} a_i x_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} x_i x_j & \text{if } \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = r, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

M-convex?

Here we assume that $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$ and the effective domain $\operatorname{dom} f := \{x \in \{0,1\}^n \mid f(x) \text{ takes a finite value}\}$ is nonempty. In this paper, functions can take the infinite value $+\infty$, where $a < +\infty$, $a + \infty = +\infty$ for $a \in \mathbf{R}$, and $0 \cdot (+\infty) = 0$. In the case where a_{ij} takes a finite value for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$, the following theorem is immediate from [7, Theorem 6.4] (see also [7, Proposition 6.8]).

Theorem 1.1 ([7]; see also [10, Theorem 5.2])**.** *Suppose that a_{ij} takes a finite value for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$. Then a function of the form* (1) *is M-convex if and only if*

$$a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\} \tag{2}$$

holds for every distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$.

By Theorem 1.1, if a_{ij} is a finite value for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$, then (QMCTP) is solvable in polynomial time. However, if a_{ij} can take the infinite value $+\infty$ for some distinct $i, j \in [n]$, there exists an example such that the condition (2) does not characterize M-convexity. Indeed, define $f : \{0,1\}^5 \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ by

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) := \begin{cases} x_1x_3 + 2x_1x_4 + (+\infty) \cdot x_1x_5 + x_3x_5 + 2x_4x_5 & \text{if } \sum_i x_i = 3, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Then f is M-convex; this can be verified by the definition of M-convexity. However, the condition (2) is violated since $a_{12} + a_{34} < \min\{a_{13} + a_{24}, a_{14} + a_{23}\}$ with $a_{12} + a_{34} = 0$, $a_{13} + a_{24} = 1$, and $a_{14} + a_{23} = 2$. Thus, in the general case, the complexity of (QMCTP) is not settled yet.

In this paper, we settle this problem by showing the following negative result.

Theorem 1.2. (QMCTP) *is co-NP complete.*

We also prove a positive result under the following seemingly natural condition.

Condition A: For any $i \in [n]$, there exists $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$ with $x_i = 1$.

Theorem 1.3. *If* Condition A *holds,* (QMCTP) *is solvable in $O(n^2)$ time.*

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1.2. By the necessity of M-convexity under Condition A, we can classify functions into three types. In Section 3, we present a characterization of M-convexity under Condition A for three types. This characterization implies Theorem 1.1. In Section 4, we propose $O(n^2)$-time algorithms for (QMCTP) for each type, and prove the validity of these algorithms. Thus, we show Theorem 1.3.

2 Co-NP Completeness of (QMCTP)

In this section, we show the co-NP completeness of (QMCTP) in the general case. In order to show Theorem 1.2, we prepare some lemmas.

In the terminology of discrete convex analysis, $X \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ is said to be *M-convex* if for $x, y \in X$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)$, there exists $j \in \mathrm{supp}(y) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(x)$ such that $x - \chi_i + \chi_j, y + \chi_i - \chi_j \in X$. That is, an M-convex set X is nothing but the base family of some matroid. Note that if f is M-convex, then dom f is M-convex.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that f is a function of the form* (1) *such that* dom f *is M-convex. For some distinct $i, j \in [n]$, assume that there exist $x, y \in$ dom f with $x_i = 1$ and $y_j = 1$. Then, if $a_{ij} < +\infty$, there exists $z \in$ dom f with $z_i = z_j = 1$.*

Proof. Take $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ with $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)|$ minimum satisfying $x_i = y_j = 1$. It suffices to show $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)| = 0$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)| > 0$. First we assume $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)| \geq 2$. Then there exists $i' \neq i$ such that $i' \in \mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)$. By the M-convexity of dom f for x, y, and i', there exists $j' \in \mathrm{supp}(y) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(x)$ such that $x - \chi_{i'} + \chi_{j'} \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$. If $j' = j$, then $x' := x - \chi_{i'} + \chi_j$ satisfies $x'_i = x'_j = 1$, a contradiction. If $j' \neq j$, then $x' := x - \chi_{i'} + \chi_{j'}$ satisfies $x'_i = y_j = 1$ and $|\mathrm{supp}(x') \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)| < |\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)|$. This is also a contradiction to the minimality of x and y. Hence we have $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)| = 1 = |\mathrm{supp}(y) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(x)|$.

Since $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$, it holds that $a_{kl}, a_{ik}, a_{jk} < +\infty$ for any $k, l \in \mathrm{supp}(x - \chi_i) (= \mathrm{supp}(y - \chi_j))$. Moreover, we have $a_{ij} < +\infty$ by the assumption. Hence we obtain $z := x - \chi_k + \chi_j \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ for $k \in \mathrm{supp}(x - \chi_i)$. Hence z satisfies $z_i = z_j = 1$, a contradiction. Thus, we have $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y)| = 0$. □

For a function f of the form (1), we define an undirected graph $G_f = ([n], E_f)$ by $E_f := \{\{i, j\} \mid i, j \in [n],\ i \neq j,\ a_{ij} = +\infty\}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that* Condition A *holds. Then* dom f *is an M-convex set if and only if each connected component of G_f is a complete graph.*

Proof. (if part). Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ be the connected components of G_f. Then dom f is represented by $\mathrm{dom}\, f = \{x \in \{0,1\}^n \mid \sum_i x_i = r,\ |x \cap A_p| \leq 1 \text{ for all } p \in [m]\}$. Hence dom f can be considered as the base family of a partition matroid. This implies that dom f is M-convex.

(only-if part). We prove the contrapositive. Suppose that some connected component of G_f is not complete. That is, there exist distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$ such that $\{i, j\}, \{j, k\} \in E_f$ and $\{i, k\} \notin E_f$. By Condition A, $a_{ik} < +\infty$, and Lemma 2.1, there exists $x \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ with $x_i = x_k = 1$.

Take any $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ with $x_i = x_k = 1$ and $y_j = 1$. Since $a_{ij} = a_{jk} = +\infty$, we have $\mathrm{supp}(x) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(y) \supseteq \{i, k\}$. Then for all $j' \in \mathrm{supp}(y) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(x)$, it holds that $x - \chi_i + \chi_{j'} \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$ or $y + \chi_i - \chi_{j'} \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$. Indeed, if $j' = j$, then $x - \chi_i + \chi_j \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$ holds from $a_{kj} = +\infty$, and if $j' \neq j$, then $y + \chi_i - \chi_{j'} \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$ holds from $a_{ij} = +\infty$. This implies that dom f is not M-convex. □

Here we consider the following problem (P):

Given: A graph $G = (V, E)$ having an independent set with cardinality r.

Question: Let $T := \bigcup\{S \subseteq V \mid S \text{ is an independent set of } G \text{ with } |S| = r\}$. Is each connected component of the subgraph of G induced by T a complete graph?

Lemma 2.3. *The problem* (P) *is co-NP complete.*

Proof. It is clear that the problem (P) is in co-NP. We show the co-NP hardness of (P) by reduction from the independent set problem, which is an NP-complete problem: Given $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer $k \leq |V|$, we determine whether G contains an independent set of size at least k. For a given graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer m, define $G_m := (V \cup V_m, E \cup E_m)$ by $|V_m| = m$, $V_m \cap V = \emptyset$, and $E_m := \{\{i, j\} \mid i \in V,\ j \in V_m\}$. Let $T_m := \bigcup\{S \subseteq V \mid S \text{ is an independent set of } G_m \text{ with } |S| = m\}$. Since $T_m \supseteq V_m$, each connected component of the subgraph of G_m induced by T_m is complete if and only if G does not have an independent set with cardinality at least m. Therefore we have the cardinality of a maximum independent set of G by solving (P) for G_k ($k = |V|, |V| - 1, \ldots, 1$). Indeed, the first k such that we output "no" by solving (P) for G_k is equal to the cardinality of a maximum independent set. Since the maximum independent set problem has a polynomial-time reduction to (P), (P) is co-NP hard. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It is clear that (QMCTP) is in co-NP. We show the co-NP hardness of (QMCTP) by reduction from the problem (P). Let $G = ([n], E)$ be a graph having an independent set with cardinality r. We define f_G by

$$f_G(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) := \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} x_i x_j & \text{if } \displaystyle\sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = r, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $a_{ij} := +\infty$ for $\{i, j\} \in E$ and $a_{ij} := 0$ for $\{i, j\} \notin E$. Note that $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$ if and only if $\operatorname{supp}(x)$ is an independent set of G. We have $\operatorname{dom} f_G \neq \emptyset$ by the assumption that G has an independent set with cardinality r. We define X by $X := \bigcup\{x \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid \operatorname{supp}(x) \text{ is an independent set of } G \text{ with } |\operatorname{supp}(x)| = r\}$. Then there exists $x \in \operatorname{dom} f_G$ with $x_i = 1$ if and only if $i \in X$. For $x \in \{0, 1\}^X$, define $\tilde{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ by $\tilde{x}_i := x_i$ if $i \in X$ and $\tilde{x}_i := 0$ if $i \in [n] \setminus X$. Moreover define $f_G|_X(x) := f_G(\tilde{x})$ for $x \in \{0, 1\}^X$. By the definition of X, f_G is M-convex (i.e., $\operatorname{dom} f_G$ is M-convex) if and only if $f_G|_X$ is M-convex (i.e., $\operatorname{dom} f_G$ is M-convex). Furthermore, by Lemma 2.2, $f_G|_X$ is M-convex if and only if each connected component of the subgraph of G induced by X is complete. This means that we can solve (P) by solving (QMCTP) for f_G. □

3 Characterization of Quadratic M-Convexity

In this section, we present a characterization of M-convexity under Condition A, which implies Theorem 1.1. By Lemma 2.2, we see that the following Condition B is necessary for the M-convexity.

Condition B: Each connected component of G_f is a complete graph.

Therefore, in this section, we can assume that a function f of the form (1) satisfies Conditions A and B. Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ be the vertex sets of the connected components of G_f with at least one edge, and define $A_0 := [n] \setminus \bigcup_{p=1}^{m} A_p$, which denotes the set of isolated vertices. Then we classify the types of f as follows.

Type I: $|A_0| + m \geq r + 2$.

Type II: $|A_0| + m = r + 1$.

Type III: $|A_0| + m = r$.

If $|A_0| + m < r$, then we have dom $f = \emptyset$. Hence we exclude this case.

Theorem 3.1. (I): *A function f of Type* I *is M-convex if and only if it holds that*

$$a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\},$$

for every distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$.

(II): *A function f of Type* II *is M-convex if and only if it holds that*

$$a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk},$$

for every $p \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in [n] \setminus A_p$.

(III): *A function f of Type* III *is M-convex if and only if it holds that*

$$a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk},$$

for every distinct $p, q \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in A_q$.

Moreover, if f is an M-convex function of Type II *or* III*, then f is a linear function on* dom f*.*

We note that the function defined in (3) is of Type II. If a_{ij} is finite value for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$, the function f is of Type I. Hence Theorem 3.1 implies Theorem 1.1 as the finite case. By Theorem 3.1, we see that (QMCTP) is solvable in polynomial time under Condition A.

In the proof of Theorem 3.1, we use the following facts about the local exchange axiom characterizing M-convexity, which are immediate corollaries of [7, Theorem 6.4] (see also [7, Proposition 6.8]).

Theorem 3.2 ([7])**.** *A function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ with* dom $f \subseteq \{x \in \{0,1\}^n \mid \sum_i x_i = r\}$ *is M-convex if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} &f(z + \chi_i + \chi_j) + f(z + \chi_k + \chi_l) \\ &\quad \geq \min\{f(z + \chi_i + \chi_k) + f(z + \chi_j + \chi_l), f(z + \chi_i + \chi_l) + f(z + \chi_j + \chi_k)\} \end{aligned}$$

holds for all $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ and all distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ such that $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in$ dom f*.*

Lemma 3.3. *A function f of the form* (1) *is M-convex if and only if for every distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ such that there exists $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ with $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in$* dom f*, it holds that*

$$a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}.$$

Note that, by Lemma 3.3, the condition (2) in Theorem 1.1 is sufficient for M-convexity. However, this is not necessary in general.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Take any $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ and distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ such that $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in$ dom f. By Theorem 3.2, it suffices to show that for such i, j, k, l,

$$\begin{aligned} &f(z + \chi_i + \chi_j) + f(z + \chi_k + \chi_l) \\ &\quad \geq \min\{f(z + \chi_i + \chi_k) + f(z + \chi_j + \chi_l), f(z + \chi_i + \chi_l) + f(z + \chi_j + \chi_k)\} \end{aligned}$$

holds if and only if $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$ holds (note that the inequality $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$ is independent of the choice of z).

Define $g : \{0,1\}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ by

$$g(x) := \sum_{i\in[n]} a_i x_i + \sum_{1\le i<j\le n} a_{ij} x_i x_j$$

for $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \{0,1\}^n$. Then we have

$$f(z+\chi_i+\chi_j) = g(z) + a_i + a_j + \sum_{p\in\mathrm{supp}(z)} a_{ip} + \sum_{p\in\mathrm{supp}(z)} a_{jp} + a_{ij}, \tag{4}$$

$$f(z+\chi_k+\chi_l) = g(z) + a_k + a_l + \sum_{p\in\mathrm{supp}(z)} a_{kp} + \sum_{p\in\mathrm{supp}(z)} a_{lp} + a_{kl}. \tag{5}$$

Since $f(z+\chi_i+\chi_j)$ and $f(z+\chi_k+\chi_l)$ take finite values, each term of (4) and (5), i.e., $g(z)$, a_{ij}, a_{kl}, and $a_{ip}, a_{jp}, a_{kp}, a_{lp}$ for $p \in \mathrm{supp}(z)$, also takes a finite value. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &f(z+\chi_i+\chi_j) + f(z+\chi_k+\chi_l) \\ &\quad \ge \min\{f(z+\chi_i+\chi_k) + f(z+\chi_j+\chi_l), f(z+\chi_i+\chi_l) + f(z+\chi_j+\chi_k)\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow a_{ij} + a_{kl} \ge \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A function f is said to be *M-concave* if $-f$ is M-convex. The following theorem (M-separation theorem) holds.

Theorem 3.4 ([7, Theorem 8.15])**.** *Suppose that f is M-convex and g is M-concave satisfying* $\mathrm{dom}\, f \cap \mathrm{dom}\, g \neq \emptyset$ *and $g(x) \le f(x)$ for any $x \in \mathrm{dom}\, f \cap \mathrm{dom}\, g$. Then there exist $\alpha^* \in \mathbf{R}$ and $p^* \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that*

$$g(x) \le \alpha^* + \sum_{i\in[n]} p_i^* x_i \le f(x) \qquad (x \in \mathrm{dom}\, f \cap \mathrm{dom}\, g).$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First we show the characterization of M-convexity. For $i \in [n]$ denote by B_i the connected component of G_f containing i. That is, $B_i = \{i\}$ for $i \in A_0$, and $B_i = A_p$ for $i \in A_p$. Note that $x \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ if and only if $\sum_i x_i = r$ and $|\mathrm{supp}(x) \cap A_p| \le 1$ for $p \in [m]$, and that if $a_{ij} = +\infty$ or $a_{kl} = +\infty$, it holds that $f(z+\chi_i+\chi_j) = +\infty$ or $f(z+\chi_k+\chi_l) = +\infty$ for all $z \in \{0,1\}^n$. In the following, we consider each type in turn.

Type I. We see that for all distinct $i,j,k,l \in [n]$ with $a_{ij} < +\infty$ and $a_{kl} < +\infty$, there exists $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $z+\chi_i+\chi_j, z+\chi_k+\chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$. $|A_0 \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l\}| \ge r-2$ holds since $|A_0| + m \ge r+2$. Therefore we can take $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ satisfying $\mathrm{supp}(z) \subseteq [n] \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)$, $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap A_p| \le 1$ for $p \in [m]$, and $\sum_i z_i = r-2$. Then $z+\chi_i+\chi_j, z+\chi_k+\chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ holds for such z.

By Lemma 3.3, f is M-convex if and only if for every distinct $i,j,k,l \in [n]$ with $a_{ij}, a_{kl} < +\infty$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \ge \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$. Moreover, if $a_{ij} = +\infty$ or $a_{kl} = +\infty$, then $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \ge \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$ automatically holds. Hence f is M-convex if and only if for every distinct $i,j,k,l \in [n]$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \ge \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$.

Type II. We see that for distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ with $a_{ij}, a_{kl} < +\infty$, there exists $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ if and only if $(B_i \cup B_j) \cap (B_k \cup B_l) \neq \emptyset$ holds (note that we have $B_i \cap B_j = B_k \cap B_l = \emptyset$ since $a_{ij}, a_{kl} < +\infty$).

Suppose $(B_i \cup B_j) \cap (B_k \cup B_l) = \emptyset$ (i.e., B_i, B_j, B_k, and B_l are all disjoint). Then $|A_0| + m \geq 4$. Hence $r \geq 3$ since $|A_0| + m = r + 1$. Furthermore we obtain $|A_0 \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l\}| = r - 3$. Hence for all $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\sum_i z_i = r - 2$ and $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap A_p| \leq 1$ for $p \in [m]$ with $A_p \neq B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l$, it holds that $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| \neq \emptyset$. This means $z + \chi_i + \chi_j \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$ or $z + \chi_k + \chi_l \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$. Thus, for $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ with $(B_i \cup B_j) \cap (B_k \cup B_l) = \emptyset$, there is no z satisfying $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$.

Suppose $(B_i \cup B_j) \cap (B_k \cup B_l) \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we also suppose $B_i \cap B_k \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $p \in [m]$ such that $B_i = B_k = A_p$. Since $|A_0| + m = r + 1$, we have $|A_0 \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l\}| = |A_0 \setminus (B_j \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{A_p, B_j, B_l\}| \geq r - 2$. Therefore we can take $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ satisfying $\mathrm{supp}(z) \subseteq [n] \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)$, $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap A_p| \leq 1$ for $p \in [m]$, and $\sum_i z_i = r - 2$. Then $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ holds for such z.

By Lemma 3.3, f is M-convex if and only if for every $p \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in [n] \setminus A_p$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$. Since $a_{ik} = +\infty$, the above inequality can be represented as $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq a_{il} + a_{jk}$. Moreover, by replacing j with l, we have $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \leq a_{il} + a_{jk}$. Hence f is M-convex if and only if for every $p \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in [n] \setminus A_p$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk}$.

Type III. We see that for distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ with $a_{ij}, a_{kl} < +\infty$, there exists $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ if and only if $B_i \cup B_j = B_k \cup B_l$ holds.

Suppose $B_i \cup B_j \neq B_k \cup B_l$. Without loss of generality, we also suppose $B_i \neq B_k$ and $B_i \neq B_l$. Then $|A_0| + m \geq 3$. Hence $r \geq 3$ since $|A_0| + m = r$. Furthermore we obtain $|A_0 \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l\}| \leq |A_0 \setminus (B_i \cup B_k \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{B_i, B_k, B_l\}| = r - 3$. Hence for all $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\sum_i z_i = r - 2$ and $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap A_p| \leq 1$ for $p \in [m]$ with $A_p \neq B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l$, it holds that $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| \neq \emptyset$. This means $z + \chi_i + \chi_j \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$ or $z + \chi_k + \chi_l \notin \mathrm{dom}\, f$. Thus, for $i, j, k, l \in [n]$ with $(B_i \cup B_j) \cap (B_k \cup B_l) = \emptyset$, there is no z satisfying $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$.

Suppose $B_i \cup B_j = B_k \cup B_l$. Without loss of generality, we also suppose $B_i = B_k$ and $B_j = B_l$. Then there exist distinct $p, q \in [m]$ such that $B_i = B_k = A_p$ and $B_j = B_l = A_q$. Since $|A_0| + m = r$, we have $|A_0 \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{B_i, B_j, B_k, B_l\}| = |A_0| + |\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\} \setminus \{A_p, A_q\}| = r - 2$. Therefore we can take $z \in \{0,1\}^n$ satisfying $\mathrm{supp}(z) \subseteq [n] \setminus (B_i \cup B_j \cup B_k \cup B_l)$, $|\mathrm{supp}(z) \cap A_p| \leq 1$ for $p \in [m]$, and $\sum_i z_i = r - 2$. Then $z + \chi_i + \chi_j, z + \chi_k + \chi_l \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ holds for such z.

By Lemma 3.3, f is M-convex if and only if for every distinct $p, q \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in A_q$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$. Since $a_{ik} = a_{jl} = +\infty$, the above inequality can be represented as $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq a_{il} + a_{jk}$. Moreover, by replacing j with l, we have $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \leq a_{il} + a_{jk}$. Hence f is M-convex if and only if for every distinct $p, q \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in A_q$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk}$.

Linearity. Then we show linearity of an M-convex function f of Type II or III. By the characterization of Type II or III, the function g defined by

$$g(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } f(x) < +\infty, \\ -\infty & \text{if } f(x) = +\infty \end{cases}$$

is M-concave for an M-convex function f of Type II or III. By Theorem 3.4, there exist $\alpha^* \in \mathbf{R}$ and $p^* \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that

$$f(x) = g(x) \leq \alpha^* + \sum_{i \in [n]} p_i^* x_i \leq f(x) \qquad (x \in \mathrm{dom}\ f).$$

This means that f is a linear function on dom f. □

4 Testing Quadratic M-Convexity in Quadratic Time

In this section, we present an $O(n^2)$-time algorithm for (QMCTP) under the assumption that a function f of the form (1) satisfies Condition A (and Condition B). As seen in Section 3, f is classified into Types I, II, or III. For Types I, II, and III, we give Algorithms I, II, and III, respectively.

4.1 Algorithms

By Theorem 3.1, we see that the M-convexity of a function of the form (1) depends only on quadratic coefficients $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$. We say that a function f of the form (1) is defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ if the quadratic coefficients of f is equal to $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$. We also say that $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ satisfies the *anti-tree metric property* if $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$ holds for all distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$, and that $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ satisfies the *anti-ultrametric property* if $a_{ij} \geq \min\{a_{ik}, a_{jk}\}$ holds for all distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$. Note that the anti-tree metric property characterizes the M-convexity of functions of Type I (cf. Theorem 3.1).

Algorithm I (for Type I).

Step 1: Define $\alpha := \min\{a_{ij} \mid i, j \in [n]\}$, $b_i := \min\{a_{ij} \mid j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}\} - \alpha$ for $i \in [n]$, and $\hat{a}_{ij} := a_{ij}$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

Step 2: Update $\hat{a}_{ij} \leftarrow \hat{a}_{ij} - b_i - b_j$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

Step 3: If $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property, output that "f is M-convex." Otherwise, output that "f is not M-convex." □

Algorithm II (for Type II).

Step 1: Define $\alpha := \min\{a_{ij} \mid i, j \in [n]\}$ and $\hat{a}_{ij} := a_{ij}$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

Step 2: For each $i \in [n] \setminus A_0$, do the following:

Step 2-1: Define $b_i := \min\{\hat{a}_{ij} \mid j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}\} - \alpha$.

Step 2-2: Update $\hat{a}_{ij} \leftarrow \hat{a}_{ij} - b_i$ for $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$.

Step 3: If $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$ satisfies

$$\hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{pq} & \text{if } i \in A_p \text{ and } j \in A_q, \\ \alpha_{(i,p)} & \text{if } i \in A_0 \text{ and } j \in A_p \end{cases}$$

for some α_{pq} (distinct $p, q \in [m]$) and some $\alpha_{(i,p)}$ ($p \in [m]$), output that "f is M-convex." Otherwise, output that "f is not M-convex." □

Algorithm III (for Type III).

Step 1: Define $\alpha_{pq} := \min\{a_{ij} \mid i \in A_p, j \in A_q\}$ for distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $b_{(i,q)} := \min\{a_{ij} \mid j \in A_q\} - \alpha_{pq}$ for $p \in [m] \setminus \{q\}$ and $i \in A_p$, and $\hat{a}_{ij} := a_{ij}$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

Step 2: Update $\hat{a}_{ij} \leftarrow \hat{a}_{ij} - b_{(i,q)} - b_{(j,p)}$ for distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$.

Step 3: If $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies $\hat{a}_{ij} = \alpha_{pq}$ for all distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$, output that "f is M-convex." Otherwise, output that "f is not M-convex." □

Theorem 4.1. *Algorithms* I, II, *and* III *work correctly and run in* $O(n^2)$ *time.*

By Theorem 4.1, we obtain Theorem 1.3. In the rest of this section, we give the proof of Theorem 4.1. It is clear that the running time of Algorithms II and III are $O(n^2)$. In Section 4.2, we show the validity of Algorithms I, II, and III, and show that we can check the anti-ultrametric property of given $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ in $O(n^2)$ time in Step 3 of Algorithm I.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

For brevity of notation, we denote $\min\{a_{ij} \mid j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}\}$ by $\min_j a_{ij}$.

4.2.1 Validity of Algorithm I.

We can easily see that if $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property, then $a_{ij} + a_{kl} \geq \min\{a_{ik} + a_{jl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$ holds for every distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$. Hence the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is M-convex by Theorem 3.1. Observe that if the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is M-convex, the function defined by $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is also M-convex, where

$$\hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_{ij} + b & \text{if } i^* \in \{i, j\}, \\ a_{ij} & \text{if } i^* \notin \{i, j\}, \end{cases} \qquad (i, j \in [n],\ i \neq j)$$

for some $i^* \in [n]$ and $b \in \mathbf{R}$. This means that the (inverse) operation of Step 2 does not change the M-convexity of the function. Thus, if Algorithm I returns the output "f is M-convex," f is actually M-convex. Therefore, the validity of Algorithm I is established by proving that Algorithm I returns "f is M-convex" whenever f is M-convex. We need some lemmas to show this statement. In the following, suppose that $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, i.e., $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-tree metric property. Recall that $\alpha := \min\{a_{ij} \mid i, j \in [n]\}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that* $\min_j a_{ij} = \alpha$ *holds for all* $i \in [n]$. *Then* $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ *satisfies the anti-ultrametric property.*

Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that there exist distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$ with $a_{ij} < \min\{a_{ik}, a_{jk}\}$. Then $a_{ik} > \alpha < a_{jk}$ holds. Hence, by the assumption, there exists $l \in [n] \setminus \{i, j, k\}$ satisfying $a_{kl} = \alpha$. Then we obtain $a_{ik} > a_{ij} < a_{jk}$ and $a_{jl} \geq a_{kl} \leq a_{il}$. Thus, for such $i, j, k, l \in [n]$, it holds that $a_{ik} + a_{jl} > a_{ij} + a_{kl} < a_{il} + a_{jk}$. This contradicts the anti-tree metric property of $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. □

By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show that if $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, it holds that $\min_j a_{ij} = \alpha$ for any $i \in [n]$ after Step 2 of Algorithm I. In the following, we prove this.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that* $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij} > \alpha$ *holds for* $i, j \in [n]$. *Then there exists* $k \in [n]$ *such that* $a_{jk} = \alpha$.

Proof. We show this by induction on n (the number of variables of f).

In the case of $n = 4$, it suffices to prove that if $\min\{a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{14}\} = a_{12} > \alpha$, we have $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}\} = \alpha$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}\} > \alpha$. By the assumption and $\min\{a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{14}, a_{23}, a_{24}, a_{34}\} = \alpha$, we obtain $a_{34} = \alpha$. Then, since $\min\{a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{14}\} = a_{12}$, we have $a_{14} \geq a_{12} \leq a_{13}$, and since $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}\} > \alpha$, we have $a_{23} > a_{34} < a_{24}$. Therefore we have $a_{14} + a_{23} > a_{12} + a_{34} < a_{13} + a_{24}$. This contradicts the anti-tree metric property of $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$.

In the case of $n \geq 5$, it suffices to prove that if $\min\{a_{12}, a_{13}, \ldots, a_{1n}\} = a_{12} > \alpha$, we have $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}, \ldots, a_{2n}\} = \alpha$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}, \ldots, a_{2n}\} = a_{23} > \alpha$. Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in\{2,3,\ldots,n\}}$ also defines an M-convex function. Moreover, since $\min\{a_{12}, a_{13}, \ldots, a_{1n}\} > \alpha$, we have $\min\{a_{ij} \mid i, j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}\} = \alpha$. By $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}, \ldots, a_{2n}\} = a_{23} > \alpha$ and the induction hypothesis, there exists $k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$ such that $a_{3k} = \alpha$ (without loss of generality assume $k = 4$). Since $\min\{a_{12}, a_{13}, \ldots, a_{1n}\} = a_{12}$ and $\min\{a_{23}, a_{24}, \ldots, a_{2n}\} > \alpha$, it holds that $a_{14} \geq a_{12} \leq a_{13}$ and $a_{23} > a_{34} < a_{24}$. Therefore we have $a_{14} + a_{23} > a_{12} + a_{34} < a_{13} + a_{24}$. This contradicts the anti-tree metric property of $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. □

Define $G_{\min} := (V_{\min}, E_{\min})$ by $E_{\min} := \{\{i, j\} \mid a_{ij} = \alpha\}$ and $V_{\min} := \{i \in [n] \mid i \in \exists e \in E_{\min}\}$.

Lemma 4.4. *$G_{\min}$ is connected. Moreover, for all $i, j \in V_{\min}$, there exists an i-j path having at most two edges in $G_{\min}$.*

Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that $G_{\min}$ is not connected. Then there exist $i, j, k, l \in V_{\min}$ such that $\{i, j\}, \{k, l\} \in E_{\min} \not\ni \{i, k\}, \{i, l\}, \{j, k\}, \{j, l\}$. For such i, j, k, l, we obtain $a_{ik} > a_{ij} < a_{il}$ and $a_{jl} > a_{kl} < a_{jk}$. Hence $a_{ik} + a_{jl} > a_{ij} + a_{kl} < a_{il} + a_{jk}$ holds. This contradicts the anti-tree metric property of $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$.

Suppose, to the contrary, that there exist $i, j \in V_{\min}$ such that all i-j paths in $G_{\min}$ have at least three edges. Let $P = \{i = i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_m = j\}$ be an i-j shortest path with respect to the number of edges (note that $m \geq 3$). For $i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3 \in V_{\min}$, we have $a_{i_0 i_1} = a_{i_1 i_2} = a_{i_2 i_3} = \alpha$ since P is a path in $G_{\min}$. Furthermore, by the minimality of P, we obtain $\min\{a_{i_0 i_2}, a_{i_0 i_3}, a_{i_1 i_3}\} > \alpha$. Hence $a_{i_0 i_2} + a_{i_1 i_3} > a_{i_0 i_1} + a_{i_2 i_3} < a_{i_0 i_3} + a_{i_i i_2}$ holds. This contradicts the anti-tree metric property of $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. □

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij} > \alpha$ holds for $i, j \in [n]$. Define $b_i := a_{ij} - \alpha$. Then $a_{ik} - b_i \geq \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$ holds for all $k \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$.*

Proof. Take any $k \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$. If $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = \alpha$, then it holds that $a_{ik} - b_i = a_{ik} - a_{ij} + \alpha \geq \alpha = \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$. This means that if $k = j$, the statement holds by Lemma 4.3. Hence, in the following, suppose $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} > \alpha$ (note that $k \neq j$ holds). If $a_{ik} = \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$, we have $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = \alpha$ by Lemma 4.3. This contradicts $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij} > \alpha$. Thus we obtain $a_{ik} > \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$. By the above discussion, we consider the following three cases.

(Case 1: $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{jk}$). By Lemma 4.3, $a_{jl} = \alpha$ holds for some $l \in [n] \setminus \{i, j, k\}$. Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-tree metric property, we have $a_{ik} + a_{jl} \geq \min\{a_{ij} + a_{kl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$. Moreover, by $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij}$ and $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{jk}$, it holds that $a_{il} \geq a_{ij}$ and $a_{kl} \geq a_{jk}$, respectively. Hence $a_{ik} + a_{jl} \geq \min\{a_{ij} + a_{kl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\} \geq a_{ij} + a_{jk}$ holds. Since $a_{jl} = \alpha$ and $b_i = a_{ij} - \alpha$, we obtain $a_{ik} - b_i \geq a_{jk} = \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$.

(Case 2: $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{kl}$ for some $l \neq j$ and $a_{jl} = \alpha$). Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-tree metric property, we have $a_{ik} + a_{jl} \geq \min\{a_{ij} + a_{kl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\}$. Moreover, by $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij}$ and $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{kl}$, it holds that $a_{il} \geq a_{ij}$ and $a_{jk} \geq a_{kl}$, respectively. Hence $a_{ik} + a_{jl} \geq \min\{a_{ij} + a_{kl}, a_{il} + a_{jk}\} \geq a_{ij} + a_{kl}$ holds. Since $a_{jl} = \alpha$ and $b_i = a_{ij} - \alpha$, we obtain $a_{ik} - b_i \geq a_{kl} = \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$.

(Case 3: $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{kl}$ for some $l \neq j$ and $a_{jl} > \alpha$). By Lemma 4.3, we have $j, l \in V_{\min}$ since $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij} > \alpha$ and $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{kl} > \alpha$. By Lemma 4.4, there exists a j-l path having

at most two edges. Then the assumption of $a_{jl} > \alpha$ means that there exists $p \in [n] \setminus \{i, j, k, l\}$ such that $a_{jp} = a_{lp} = \alpha$.

Suppose, to the contrary, that $a_{jk} > a_{kl}$. Then $a_{jk} + a_{lp} > a_{jp} + a_{kl}$ holds. Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-tree metric property, it holds that $a_{jk} + a_{lp} > a_{jp} + a_{kl} = a_{jl} + a_{kp}$. Therefore we obtain $a_{kp} = a_{kl} + a_{jp} - a_{jl}$. Since $a_{jl} > \alpha$, we have $a_{kp} < a_{kl}$. However this contradicts $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{kl}$. Hence we obtain $a_{jk} = a_{kl}$.

Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-tree metric property, it holds that $a_{ik} + a_{jp} \geq \min\{a_{ip} + a_{jk}, a_{ij} + a_{kp}\}$. By $\min_{j'} a_{ij'} = a_{ij}$ and $\min_{i'} a_{i'k} = a_{kl}$, it holds that $a_{ip} \geq a_{ij}$ and $a_{kp} \geq a_{kl}$, respectively. Moreover, by $a_{jk} = a_{kl}$, we have $a_{ik} + a_{jp} \geq \min\{a_{ip} + a_{jk}, a_{ij} + a_{kp}\} \geq a_{ij} + a_{kl}$. Since $a_{jp} = \alpha$ and $b_i = a_{ij} - \alpha$, we obtain $a_{ik} - b_i \geq a_{kl} = \min_{i'} a_{i'k}$. □

Let $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ be the quadratic coefficients after Step 2, that is, $\hat{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} - b_i - b_j$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$. We show that $\min_j \hat{a}_{ij} = \alpha$ for any $i \in [n]$.

Take any $i \in [n]$. Since $b_i \geq 0$, it holds that $\min_j \hat{a}_{ij} \leq \min_j a_{ij} - b_i = \alpha$. Next we prove $\min_j \hat{a}_{ij} \geq \alpha$. If $\min_j a_{ij} = \alpha$, we have $b_i = 0$. Hence we obtain $\min_j \hat{a}_{ij} = \min_j\{a_{ij} - b_j\} \geq \alpha$. If $\min_j a_{ij} > \alpha$, by Lemma 4.5, we obtain $\min_j \hat{a}_{ij} \geq \min_j\{\min_k a_{jk} - b_j\} = \alpha$.

4.2.2 Time Complexity of Algorithm I.

It suffices to prove that we can determine whether $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property in $O(n^2)$ time. First we present a key lemma for designing an $O(n^2)$-time algorithm.

Lemma 4.6 ([5, Lemma 8]). *$(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property if and only if there exist some laminar family $\mathcal{L}$ on $[n]$ and some $c_U \in \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ for $U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that*

- *$[n] \in \mathcal{L}$,*
- *if $U \subsetneq U'$, then $c_U > c_{U'}$ holds,*
- *$\hat{a}_{ij} = c_{U(i,j)}$ holds for any distinct $i, j \in [n]$, where $U(i, j)$ is the minimal element in $\mathcal{L}$ including $\{i, j\}$.*

By Lemma 4.6, we obtain the following natural procedure `Decompose`, which updates a laminar family $\mathcal{L}$ and defines $c_U \in \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ for $U \in \mathcal{L}$. Suppose that we are given $U \subseteq [n]$ and $w \in \overline{\mathbf{R}}$.

Procedure: `Decompose`(U, w).

Step 1: If $|U| \leq 1$ or $w = +\infty$, then stop.

Step 2: Take any $i \in U$. Define $e := \min\{\hat{a}_{ij} \mid j \in U \setminus \{i\}\}$ and $X := \operatorname{argmin}\{\hat{a}_{ij} \mid j \in U \setminus \{i\}\}$.

Step 3: If $e > w$, then $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \cup \{U\}$, $c_U := e$, and $w \leftarrow e$.

Step 4: Execute `Decompose`(X, w) and `Decompose`$(U \setminus X, w)$. □

For initialization, let $\mathcal{L} := \{[n]\}$ and $c_{[n]} := \alpha$. Observe that if $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property, `Decompose`$([n], \alpha)$ constructs the appropriate laminar family $\mathcal{L}$ and c_U for $U \in \mathcal{L}$ corresponding to $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. Moreover `Decompose`$([n], \alpha)$ runs in $O(n^2)$ time.

We are ready to describe an algorithm for checking the anti-ultrametric property as follows.

Algorithm I′ (for checking the anti-ultrametric property).

Step 1: Define $\mathcal{L} := \{[n]\}$ and $c_{[n]} := \alpha$.

Step 2: Execute `Decompose`$([n], \alpha)$.

Step 3: Make a copy of $\mathcal{L}$ and denote it by $\mathcal{L}'$, that is, $\mathcal{L}' := \{U' \mid U \in \mathcal{L}\}$ (the base set of $\mathcal{L}'$ is also $[n]$).

Step 4: While $\mathcal{L}' \neq \emptyset$, do the following:

Step 4-1: Take any minimal element $U' \in \mathcal{L}'$. Define $a'_{ij} := c_U$ for $\{i, j\} \subseteq U$ and $\{i, j\} \cap U' \neq \emptyset$.

Step 4-2: Let $U_+ \in \mathcal{L}$ be the minimal element in $\mathcal{L}$ with $U \subsetneq U_+$. Update $U'_+ \leftarrow U'_+ \setminus U$.

Step 4-3: Update $\mathcal{L}' \leftarrow \mathcal{L}' \setminus U'$.

Step 5: If $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]} = (a'_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$, then output "$(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property." Otherwise, output "$(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ does not satisfy the anti-ultrametric property." □

In Step 4 of Algorithm I′, note that we define the value of a'_{ij} exactly once for every distinct $i, j \in [n]$. Hence the time complexity of Step 4 is $O(n^2)$ time. Thus, we see that Algorithm I′ runs in $O(n^2)$ time. By Lemma 4.6, the validity of Algorithm I′ is clear. Therefore we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *Algorithm* I′ *works correctly and runs in* $O(n^2)$ *time.*

By Theorem 4.7, we can determine whether $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies the anti-ultrametric property in $O(n^2)$ time.

Remark 4.8. The procedure `Decompose` has already been proposed in the preprint version of [4] in the context of M-convexity, and [1, 12] in the context of ultrametrics. However, these papers considered the restricted case where a_{ij} takes a finite value for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

4.2.3 Validity of Algorithm II.

We can easily see that if $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{pq} & \text{if } i \in A_p \text{ and } j \in A_q, \\ \alpha_{(i,p)} & \text{if } i \in A_0 \text{ and } j \in A_p \end{cases}$$

for some α_{pq} (distinct $p, q \in [m]$) and some $\alpha_{(i,p)}$ ($p \in [m]$), then $a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk}$ holds for every $p \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in [n] \setminus A_p$. Hence the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is M-convex by Theorem 3.1. Observe that if the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is M-convex, the function defined by $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is also M-convex, where

$$\hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_{ij} + b & \text{if } i^* \in \{i, j\}, \\ a_{ij} & \text{if } i^* \notin \{i, j\}, \end{cases} \qquad (i, j \in [n],\ i \neq j)$$

for some $i^* \in [n] \setminus A_0$ and $b \in \mathbf{R}$. This means that the (inverse) operation of Step 2 does not change the M-convexity of the function. Thus, if Algorithm II returns the output "f is M-convex," f is actually M-convex. Therefore, the validity of Algorithm II is established by proving that Algorithm II returns "f is M-convex" whenever f is M-convex. In the following, suppose that $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, i.e., $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies $a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk}$ for every $p \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in [n] \setminus A_p$. Recall that $\alpha := \min\{a_{ij} \mid i, j \in [n]\}$.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that* $\min_j a_{ij} = \alpha$ *holds for all* $i \in [n]$. *Then* $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ *satisfies*

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{pq} & \text{if } i \in A_p \text{ and } j \in A_q, \\ \alpha_{(i,p)} & \text{if } i \in A_0 \text{ and } j \in A_p \end{cases}$$

for some α_{pq} *(distinct* $p, q \in [m]$*) and some* $\alpha_{(i,p)}$ *(*$p \in [m]$*).*

Proof. First we show $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq}$ for $i \in A_p$ and $j \in A_q$. Suppose, to the contrary, that there exist $p, q \in [m]$, $i, k \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$ with $a_{ij} < a_{jk}$. Then $a_{jk} > \alpha$ holds. Hence, by the assumption, there exists $l \in [n] \setminus \{j, k\}$ with $a_{kl} = \alpha$ (note that $l \notin A_p$ since $a_{kl} < +\infty$), and we have $a_{ij} < a_{jk}$ and $a_{kl} \leq a_{il}$. Thus, for such $i, k \in A_p$, $j \in A_q$, and $l \in [n] \setminus A_p$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} < a_{il} + a_{jk}$. This contradicts the M-convexity of the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$.

Next we show $a_{ij} = \alpha_{(i,p)}$ for $i \in A_0$ and $j \in A_p$. Suppose, to the contrary, that there exist $i \in A_0$, $p \in [m]$, and $j, k \in A_p$ with $a_{ij} < a_{ik}$. Then $a_{ik} > \alpha$ holds. Hence, by the assumption, there exists $l \in [n] \setminus \{i, k\}$ with $a_{kl} = \alpha$ (note that $l \notin A_p$ since $a_{kl} < +\infty$), and we have $a_{ij} < a_{ik}$ and $a_{kl} \leq a_{il}$. Thus, for such $i \in A_0$, $j, k \in A_p$, and $l \in [n] \setminus A_p$, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{kl} < a_{il} + a_{jk}$. This contradicts the M-convexity of the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. □

After Step 2, it is clear that $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies $\min_j \hat{a}_{ij} = \alpha$ for all $i \in [n] \setminus A_0$. Therefore, by the operation of Step 2 and Lemma 4.9, if $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, then $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies

$$\hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{pq} & \text{if } i \in A_p \text{ and } j \in A_q, \\ \alpha_{(i,p)} & \text{if } i \in A_0 \text{ and } j \in A_p \end{cases}$$

after Step 2.

4.2.4 Validity of Algorithm III.

We can easily see that if $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq}$ for all distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$, then $a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk}$ holds for every distinct $p, q \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in A_q$. Hence the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is M-convex by Theorem 3.1. Observe that if the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is M-convex, the function defined by $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ is also M-convex, where

$$\hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_{ij} + b & \text{if } i = i^* \text{ and } j \in A_q, \\ a_{ij} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad (i, j \in [n],\ i \neq j)$$

for some $i^* \in [n] \setminus A_0$, $q \in [m]$ with $i^* \notin A_q$, and $b \in \mathbf{R}$. This means that the (inverse) operation of Step 2 does not change the M-convexity of the function. Thus, if Algorithm III returns the output "f is M-convex," f is actually M-convex. Therefore, the validity of Algorithm III is established by proving that Algorithm III returns "f is M-convex" whenever f is M-convex. In the following, suppose that $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, i.e., $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies $a_{ij} + a_{kl} = a_{il} + a_{jk}$ for every distinct $p, q \in [m]$, distinct $i, k \in A_p$, and distinct $j, l \in A_q$. Recall that $\alpha_{pq} := \min\{a_{ij} \mid i \in A_p,\ j \in A_q\}$ for distinct $p, q \in [m]$ and $b_{(i,q)} := \min_{j\in A_q} a_{ij} - \alpha_{pq}$ for $p \in [m] \setminus \{q\}$ and $i \in A_p$.

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose that* $\min\{a_{ij'} \mid j' \in A_q\} = a_{ij} > \alpha_{pq}$ *holds for some distinct* $p, q \in [m]$ *and* $i \in A_p$. *Then there exists* $i' \in A_p$ *with* $a_{i'j'} = \alpha_{pq}$.

Proof. We show this by induction on $|A_p| + |A_q|$. Note that $|A_p| \geq 2$ and $|A_q| \geq 2$. We consider the case of $|A_p| + |A_q| = 4$. Let $A_p := \{1, 2\}$ and $A_q := \{3, 4\}$. It suffices to prove that if $\min\{a_{13}, a_{14}\} = a_{13} > \alpha_{pq}$, we have $a_{23} = \alpha_{pq}$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $a_{23} > \alpha_{pq}$. By the assumption and $\min\{a_{13}, a_{14}, a_{23}, a_{24}\} = \alpha_{pq}$, we obtain $a_{24} = \alpha_{pq}$. Then $a_{13} + a_{24} < a_{14} + a_{23}$ holds. This contradicts the M-convexity of the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$.

We consider the case of $|A_p| + |A_q| \geq 5$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $k := |A_p| \geq |A_q| =: l$. Note that $k \geq 3$. Let $A_p := \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k\}$ and $A_q := \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_l\}$. It suffices to prove that if $\min\{a_{i_1j_1}, a_{i_1j_2}, \ldots, a_{i_1j_l}\} = a_{i_1j_1} > \alpha_{pq}$, we have $\min\{a_{i_2j_1}, a_{i_3j_1}, \ldots, a_{i_kj_1}\} = \alpha_{pq}$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\min\{a_{i_2j_1}, a_{i_3j_1}, \ldots, a_{i_kj_1}\} = a_{i_2j_1} > \alpha_{pq}$. Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, $\{a_{ij}\}_{i\in[n]\setminus\{i_1\},j\in[n]}$ also defines an M-convex function. Moreover, since $\min\{a_{i_1j_1}, a_{i_1j_2}, \ldots, a_{i_1j_l}\} = a_{i_1j_1} > \alpha_{pq}$, we have $\min\{a_{ij} \mid i \in A_p \setminus \{i_1\},\ j \in A_q\} = \alpha_{pq}$. By $\min\{a_{i_2j_1}, a_{i_3j_1}, \ldots, a_{i_kj_1}\} = a_{i_2j_1} > \alpha_{pq}$ and the induction hypothesis, there exists $j \in A_q$ such that $a_{i_2j} = \alpha_{pq}$ (without loss of generality assume $j = j_2$). Since $\min\{a_{i_1j_1}, a_{i_1j_2}, \ldots, a_{i_1j_l}\} = a_{i_1j_1}$ and $\min\{a_{i_2j_1}, a_{i_3j_1}, \ldots, a_{i_kj_1}\} > \alpha_{pq} = a_{i_2j_2}$, it holds that $a_{i_1j_1} \leq a_{i_1j_2}$ and $a_{i_2j_2} < a_{i_2j_1}$. Therefore we have $a_{i_1j_1} + a_{i_2j_2} < a_{i_1j_2} + a_{i_2j_1}$. This contradicts the M-convexity of the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. □

Lemma 4.11. *For all distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$, it holds that $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} + b_{(j,p)}$.*

Proof. Take any $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$. Note that $\alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} \leq a_{ij} \geq \alpha_{pq} + b_{(j,p)}$ by the definition of $b_{(i,q)}$. If $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq}$, we obtain $b_{(i,q)} = b_{(j,p)} = 0$. Hence $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} + b_{(j,p)}$ holds. In the following, suppose $a_{ij} > \alpha_{pq}$.

If $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)}$ (resp. $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(j,p)}$), it holds that $\min_{j'\in A_q} a_{ij'} = a_{ij}$ (resp. $\min_{i'\in A_p} a_{i'j} = a_{ij}$). Then, by Lemma 4.10, we have $b_{(j,p)} = 0$ (resp. $b_{(i,q)} = 0$). Therefore $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} + b_{(j,p)}$ holds.

If $\alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} < a_{ij} > \alpha_{pq} + b_{(j,p)}$, there exist $i' \in A_p \setminus \{i\}$ and $j' \in A_q \setminus \{j\}$ satisfying

$$\min_{j''\in A_q} a_{ij''} = a_{ij'} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)},$$
$$\min_{i''\in A_p} a_{i''j} = a_{i'j} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(j,p)}.$$

By Lemma 4.10, there exist $i'' \in A_p \setminus \{i\}$ and $j'' \in A_q \setminus \{j\}$ with $a_{i''j'} = a_{i'j''} = \alpha_{pq}$. Suppose $a_{i'j'} > \alpha_{pq}$. Then $a_{i''j'} + a_{i'j''} < a_{i'j'} + a_{i''j''}$ holds since $a_{i''j'} < a_{i'j'}$ and $a_{i'j''} \leq a_{i''j''}$. This contradicts the M-convexity of the function defined by $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$. Hence we obtain $a_{i'j'} = \alpha_{pq}$. Since $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defines an M-convex function, it holds that $a_{ij} + a_{i'j'} = a_{ij'} + a_{i'j}$. Thus $a_{ij} = a_{ij'} + a_{i'j} - a_{i'j'} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} + b_{(j,p)}$ holds. □

By Lemma 4.11, if f is M-convex, it holds that $a_{ij} = \alpha_{pq} + b_{(i,q)} + b_{(j,p)}$ for all distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$. Hence, after Step 2, $(\hat{a}_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ satisfies $\hat{a}_{ij} = \alpha_{pq}$ for all distinct $p, q \in [m]$, $i \in A_p$, and $j \in A_q$. Then Algorithm III returns "f is M-convex."

Acknowledgments

We thank Hiroshi Hirai and Kazuo Murota for careful reading and numerous helpful comments. This research was supported by JSPS Research Fellowship for Young Scientists.

References

[1] J. C. Colberson and P. Rudnicki. A fast algorithm for construction trees from distance matrices. *Information Processing Letters*, 30:215–220, 1989.

[2] A. W. M. Dress and W. Wenzel. Valuated matroids: A new look at the greedy algorithm. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 3(2):33–35, 1990.

[3] A. W. M. Dress and W. Wenzel. Valuated matroids. *Advances in Mathematics*, 93:214–250, 1992.

[4] H. Hirai and K. Murota. M-convex functions and tree metrics. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 21:391–403, 2004. (preprint version: *Mathematical Engineering Technical Reports*, METR 2003-23, University of Tokyo, 2003.)

[5] Y. Iwamasa, K. Murota, and S. Živný. Discrete convexity in joint winner property. arXiv:1701.07645v1, 2017.

[6] K. Murota. Convexity and Steinitz's exchange property. *Advances in Mathematics*, 124:272–311, 1996.

[7] K. Murota. *Discrete Convex Analysis*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2003.

[8] K. Murota. Recent developments in discrete convex analysis. In W. Cook, L. Lovász, and J. Vygen, editors, *Research Trends in Combinatorial Optimization*, chapter 11, pages 219–260. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.

[9] K. Murota. Discrete convex analysis: A tool for economics and game theory. *Journal of Mechanism and Institution Design*, 1(1):151–273, 2016.

[10] K. Murota and A. Shioura. Quadratic M-convex and L-convex functions. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 33:318–341, 2004.

[11] C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.

[12] M. S. Waterman, T. F. Smith, M. Singh, and W. A. Beyer. Additive evolutionary trees. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 64:199–213, 1977.